UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,375	11/25/2003	Sunao Kawai	116533	4288

25944   7590   08/18/2008
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 320850
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER
HOANG, HIEU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _23 May 2008_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-55_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-55_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to the communication filed on 07/23/2008.

2.   Claims 46-55 are new.

3.   Claims 1-55 are pending.

Response to Amendment

4.   The objection of the specification has been withdrawn due to the amendment.

5.   The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claims 42-44 has been withdrawn due to the

amendment.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments on claim 1 have been fully considered but are not

persuasive.

7.   For claims 1, 39 and 42, applicant argues that the prior art Simpson does not

disclose "a monitoring system that monitors whether a request for modification of the

operational parameters issued by a second user is received during the monitoring

period". The examiner respectfully disagrees. First, there is no distinction between the

claimed "operational parameter" with a print job of Simpson. Therefore, a request to

modify an operational parameter is any request that includes or requires changes to the

print job. Simpson discloses a blocking period of a print job set or reserved by a first

user, during that period, any request that requires to cancel or interrupt (or modify) the

print job will be denied ([0074]-[0076]). Second, since the term "operational parameters"

is so broadly claimed, an operational parameter can also be read as attributes whether
a print job is interruptable or not, or conditionally interruptable as disclosed by Simpson
([0068]). For example, an unterruptable job setting will deny any request that conflicts
with the uninterruptable job during an associated monitoring period, meaning request
that needs to change that interruptability of the print job is denied. Third, an "operational
parameter" can also be read as a time period associated with the print job. Any
subsequent request that requires changes or interrupts the time period can be blocked
([0076]-[0078]).

8.   Applicant argues that the processing time is not controlled by the user. Refer to
[0074] of Simpson, a user supplies time for a processing to start. Therefore, arguments
that a user cannot control time for his print job are unpersuasive. Furthermore, the
claims recite "monitoring time (or period) with respect to operational parameters set by a
first user." It is the operational parameters which are set by the user, not the monitoring
time.

9.   Repeated arguments based on same subject matter in claim 1 are unpersuasive
for the same rationale above.

10.   Arguments based on setting of "operational parameters" being independent from
processing requests is moot in view of new ground of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

12.   The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

adequately teach how to make or use the invention, i.e., failing to disclose "operational

parameters set by a first user independent from the first user issuing a processing

request" as recited in claims 21-37, 40, 41, 43, 44, 47, 50, 51, 53, 54.

13.   Applicant's disclosure is insufficient to allow one of ordinary skilled in the art to

make or use the invention without undue experimentation because applicant did not

adequately disclose the necessary steps to perform the method (such as in claim 170).

See In re Gunn, 190 USPQ 402 (CCPA 1976.) In fact, the examiner cannot find any

disclosure in the specification regarding "operational parameters set by a first user

independent from the first user issuing a processing request".

14.   Claims 21-37, 40, 41, 43, 44, 47, 50, 51, 53, 54 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in

such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the

inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed

invention. The examiner cannot find any disclosure in the specification regarding

"operational parameters set by a first user independent from the first user issuing a

processing request".

15.   It is suggested that applicant could overcome the U.S.C. 112 first paragraph

rejection by providing a suitably detailed system diagram (with appropriate cross-

indexing in the detailed description to reference numerals on said system diagrams.) No

new matter should be added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

16.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

17.   Claims 1-8, 10-15, 20, 39, 42 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Simpson et al. (US 2003/0084086, hereafter Simpson).

18.   For claim 1, Simpson discloses a network system having a plurality of terminal

devices and an electronic device whose function is shared by said plurality of terminal

devices, said plurality of terminal devices and said electronic device being

communicatively connected through a network, operational parameters of said

electronic device being set by users of said plurality of terminal devices through the

network (abstract, fig. 1a, 1b, printers with users' personal settings), said network

system comprising:

a monitoring period determining system that determines a monitoring period with

respect to operational parameters set by a first user ([0074], [0075], estimate

processing time of a reserved print job with associated printing settings of a first user);

a monitoring system that monitors whether a request for modification of the

operational parameters issued by a second user is received during the monitoring

period ([0074]-[0076], monitor whether print job of a second user conflicts with the first

user's print time and settings, monitor whether second print job requires changes

(interrupt, pause, defer or interfere with) first print job); and

a modification control system that modifies the operational parameters in

accordance with the request for modification if the monitoring system determines that

the request for the modification is received after expiration of the monitoring period

([0076], store second print job and apply second print settings if time does not conflict),

said modification control system executing at least one of rejecting the request by

the second user and outputting a message corresponding to the request by the second

user if said monitoring system determines that the request for modification is received

during the monitoring period ([0076], prompt the second user to select a different print

time if his print time conflicts with the reserved print time with settings of the first user).

19.   For claim 2, Simpson further discloses the monitoring period is defined as a time

period after the operational parameters are set by the first user ([0075], period of

printing with settings by the first user).

20.   For claim 3, Simpson further discloses said monitoring period determining

system includes a time period inputting system, the monitoring period being determined

based on the time period input through said time period inputting system ([0074], [0075],

reserved print job has an input start time).

21.   For claim 4, Simpson further discloses an end of the monitoring period is defined

as a point of time ([0075], processing time).

22.   For claim 5, Simpson further discloses said monitoring period determining

system includes a time inputting system, an end of the monitoring period being

determined based on the point of time which is input through said time inputting system

([0074], [0075], reserved end time is based on start time and processing time).

23.   For claim 6, Simpson further discloses the message output by the modification

control system is a message, which is transmitted to the second user, indicating that a

current time is within the monitoring period ([0076], a message to the second user to

select a new start time if time conflicts).

24.   For claim 7, Simpson further discloses the message output by the modification

control system is a message, which is transmitted to the first user, informing that the

operational parameters have been modified by the second user within the monitoring

period ([0070], "job deferred" message).

25.   For claim 8, Simpson further discloses a permission requesting system that

requests the first user for permission to modify the operational parameters ([0070],

interrupt request).

26.   For claim 10, Simpson further discloses a postponed period checking system that

checks whether a postponed period for postponing the modification of the operational

parameters has expired, the postponed period being instructed by the terminal device,

said modification controlling system enabling the modification of the operational

parameters after expiration of the postponed period ([0076], postponed second print job

with settings).

27.   For claim 11, Simpson further discloses a setting management device which is

connected with said terminal device and a plurality of electronic devices through the

network, said setting management device being provided with a setting input system

that is used to input modification settings of the operational parameters for said plurality

of electronic devices, the modification settings input through said setting input system

being set in said plurality of electronic devices (fig. 5A, 2B, [0061], client machine

includes settings input module, which is a web interface).

28.   For claim 12, Simpson further discloses one of said plurality of terminal devices

includes said setting management device (fig. 5A, client machine includes settings

module).

29.   For claim 13, Simpson further discloses said setting management device

includes an electronic device selecting system that selects at least one of the plurality of

electronic devices as a target device whose operational parameters are to be modified,

the modification settings input through said setting input system being effected as the

modification settings of said at least one of the electronic devices selected by said

electronic device selecting system ([0113], select a printer for printing with personal

settings).

30.   For claim 14, Simpson further discloses said terminal device includes an

instruction system that transmits instructions to the electronic device using a

predetermined communication protocol ([0041], e.g., HArmstrongP); and wherein said

electronic device includes a job executing system that executes a job which is instructed

by said instruction system and transmitted from said terminal device using the

predetermined communication protocol ([0041], [0054], send jobs to printer using a

protocol), the operational parameters including a parameter to be used when said

electronic device communicates with said terminal device using the predetermined

communication protocol (abstract, job with selected options).

31.   For claim 15, Simpson further discloses said electronic device includes a printing system, the operational parameters including a parameter related to an output format when said electronic device prints a print job with said printing system ([0066], finishing options of print jobs).

32.   For claim 20, Simpson further discloses said electronic device includes an interruption procedure execution system that executes an interruption procedure when a predetermined job is executed, the operational parameters including a parameter that enables/disables execution of the interruption procedure during the predetermined job ([0070], interrupt an executed print job).

33.   Claims 39 and 42 are rejected for the same rationale in claim 1.

34.   For claim 45, Simpson discloses a network system having a plurality of terminal devices and an electronic device whose function is shared by said plurality of terminal device, said plurality of terminal devices and said electronic device being communicatively connected through a network, operational parameters of said electronic device being set by users of said plurality of terminal devices through the network, said network system comprising:

a monitoring condition determining system that determines a monitoring condition with respect operational parameters set by a first user ([0074]-[0076], monitoring duration of a first user's print job with associated settings);

a monitoring system that monitors whether a request for modification of the operational parameters received from a second user meets the monitoring condition

([0076], determining whether second user request is in a "black out" period set by the

first user);

a modification control system that modifies the operational parameters in

accordance with the request for modification if the monitoring system determines that

the request for the modification meets the monitoring condition, said modification control

system executes a predetermined operation if said monitoring system determines that

the request for modification does not meet the monitoring condition ([0076], apply

second print settings if outside blacked out period).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

35.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

36.   Claims 21-25, 27-32, 37, 40, 43, 46, 47, 49, 50, 52, 53, and 55 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson, in view of Parry (US

2003/0030664)

37.   For claim 21, Simpson discloses a network system having a plurality of terminal

devices and an electronic device whose function is shared by said plurality of terminal

devices, said plurality of terminal devices and said electronic device being

communicatively connected through a network, operational parameters of said

electronic device being set by users of said plurality of terminal devices through the

network, said network system comprising:

a number of execution determining system that determines the number of times

of operations to be executed by said electronic device in accordance with operational

parameters set by a first user ([0075], determine number of pages or copies to be

printed with associated settings by a first user);

a monitoring system that monitors whether time required for the number of

executed operations of said electronic device exceeds time required for the number of

times (of operations) determined by said number of execution determining system when

a request for modification of the operational parameters issued by a second user is

received ([0076], [0077], [0070], determining conflicts when a second user reserve a

second print job when pages or copies of a first user's print job are being processed);

and

a modification control system that modifies the operational parameters in

accordance with the request for modification if the monitoring system determines that

the time at executed operations of said electronic device exceeds the processing time of

the number of times determined by said number of execution determining system

([0076], store job and apply second print settings if time does not conflict),

said modification control system executing at least one of rejecting the request by

the second user and outputting a message corresponding to the request by the second

user if said monitoring system determines that the time at the number of executed

operations of said electronic device is equal to or less than the processing time of the

number of times determined by said number of execution determining system ([0076],

prompt the second user to select a different print time if his print time conflicts with the

reserved print time with settings of the first user).

Simpson does not explicitly disclose that monitoring is based on number of

executed operations.

However, Simpson discloses monitoring is based on time period that is

determined based on number of operations (such as number of pages or copies)

([0075], [0070])

Simpson does not explicitly disclose operational parameters are set

independently from issuing a processing request by a user; although Simpson discloses

that printer parameters or settings can be set for a certain user for a certain time period

without mentioning which particular print jobs or processing requests are associated

with the settings ([0068])

However, Parry discloses the same (fig. 3, 4, panels for printer settings separate

from print job processing)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Simpson and Parry so that determining a "blacked

out" stage of modification requests from subsequent users can be done based on

number of executed operations of the device instead of time monitoring so that

subsequent users can only request print jobs outside the "blacked out" stage set by the

first user ([Simpson, 0076]) to simplify or provide an alternative to Simpson's monitoring,

and to have separate printer settings from printer processing so that users can provide

settings in advance of processing for example.

38.   For claim 22, Simpson further discloses said terminal device includes an

instruction system that instructs said electronic device to execute a job; wherein said

electronic device includes a job executing system that executes the job instructed by

said terminal device, said number of execution determining system determining the

number of executions of the job to be executed by said job executing system ([0075],

fig. 2a, production device, a printer for executing print pages for a first user).

39.   For claim 23, Simpson further discloses the message output by the modification

control system is a message, which is transmitted to the second user, indicating that the

number of executed operations of said electronic device is equal to or less than the

number of times determined by said number of execution determining system ([0076],

second user is prompted to select another start time because first user's print job is in

execution).

40.   For claim 24, Simpson further discloses the message output by the modification

control system is a message, which is transmitted to the first user, informing that the

operational parameters have been modified by the second user before the number of

executed operations of said electronic device exceeds the number of times determined

by said number of execution determining system ([0070], interrupt request and job

deferred messages to the first user).

41.   Claims 25 and 27-32 are rejected for the same rationale as in claims 8 and 10-15

respectively.

42.   Claim 37 is rejected for the same rationale as in claim 20.

43.   Claims 40 and 43 are rejected for the same rationale in claim 21.

44.   For claim 46, Simpson further discloses the operational parameters comprise

functional parameters and protection parameters, the protection parameters being

parameters entered by a first user, independent from a processing request, to control

the modification of the functional parameters; and the monitoring period determining

system determines the monitoring period with respect to the protection parameters set

by the first user ([0068], protection parameters are user settings regarding when certain

printer parameters or functional parameters can be set, e.g. all boss's print jobs can be

set so that they are uninterruptable independently of the print job request (by only

checking the name of the boss) and when functional parameters can be set, for

example (examiner's interpretation), from 2 to 4 PM, Andy's jobs with certain settings

are uninterruptable).

        Simpson does not explicitly disclose operational parameters are set

independently from issuing a processing request by a user; although Simpson discloses

that printer parameters or settings can be set for a certain user for a certain time period

without mentioning which particular print jobs or processing requests are associated

with the settings ([0068])

However, Parry discloses the same (fig. 3, 4, panels for printer settings separate from print job processing)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Simpson and Parry to have separate printer settings from printer processing so that users can provide settings in advance of processing for example.

45.   For claim 47, Simpson-Parry further discloses the operational parameters comprise functional parameters and protection parameters, the protection parameters being parameters entered by a first user, independent from a processing request, to control the modification of the functional parameters (Simpson, [0068], protection parameters are user settings regarding when certain printer parameters or functional parameters can be set, e.g. all boss's print jobs can be set so that they are uninterruptable independently of the print job request (by only checking the name of the boss) and when functional parameters can be set, for example (examiner's interpretation), from 2 to 4 PM, Andy's jobs with certain settings are uninterruptable); and

the number of execution determining system determines the number of times of operations to be executed by said electronic device in accordance with the protection parameters set by the first user (Simpson, [0076], [0077], [0070], determining when pages or copies of a first user's print job are being processed and being interruptable or non-interruptable).

46.   Claims 49, 52 and 55 are rejected for the same rationale as in claim 46.

47.   Claims 50 and 53 are rejected for the same rationale as in claim 47.

48.   Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Simpson, in view of Official Notice.

49.   For claims 16-19, Official Notice is taken that user's settings relating to output

format of a print job such as banner print, sheet supply, default sheet and default tray

are well-known in the art (see e.g., Costello, US 5,547,178)

        Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Simpson and what has been known in the art to

apply user's settings relating to output format to Simpson's print jobs to provide

customized printing options for the users.

50.   Claims 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Simpson-Parry, in view of Official Notice.

51.   For claims 33-36, Official Notice is taken that user's settings relating to output

format of a print job such as banner print, sheet supply, default sheet and default tray

are well-known in the art (see e.g., Costello, US 5,547,178)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Simpson-Parry and what has been known in the

art to apply user's settings relating to output format to Simpson's print jobs to provide

customized printing options for the users.

52.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson,

in view of Nakamura et al. (US 2002/0161740, hereafter Nakamura).

53.   For claim 9, Simpson further discloses an effective period determining system

that determines whether an effective period designated by the terminal device has

expired. Simpson does not explicitly disclose a recovering system that sets the

operational parameters to previously set values after expiration of the effective period.

     However, Nakamura discloses the same ([0099]-[0101], restore the default

settings after a period of customized user's setting has expired)

     Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Simpson and Nakamura to reduce the potential

effects (conflicts) on other users.

54.   Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Simpson-Parry, in view of Nakamura.

55.   For claim 26, Simpson-Parry further discloses an effective period determining

system that determines whether an effective period designated by the terminal device

has expired. Simpson does not explicitly disclose a recovering system that sets the

operational parameters to previously set values after expiration of the effective period.

However, Nakamura discloses the same ([0099]-[0101], restore the default

settings after a period of customized user's setting has expired)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Simpson-Parry and Nakamura to reduce the

potential effects (conflicts) on other users.

56.   Claims 38, 48, 51, 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Simpson, in view of Armstrong et al. (US 2004/0039779, hereafter Armstrong).

57.   For claim 38, Simpson discloses the invention as in claim 1, Simpson further

discloses:

a message storing system that stores a message with which the operational

parameters are modified in relationship with modified operational parameters (fig. 2A,

storage devices, [0076], [0074], e.g., messages indicating "interrupt request" or "job

deferred" associated with print jobs with different settings); and

a message outputting system that outputs the message stored in relationship

with the modified operational parameters by said message storing system in response

to an output command of a message corresponding to the modified operational

parameters ([0070], output, e.g., "job deferred" message when print job is changed or

modified and second settings are applied).

Simpson does not explicitly disclose that the message is input by a user of the terminal device.

However, Armstrong discloses using customized messages that can be input by a user instead of default messages ([0110]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Simpson and Armstrong to customize status messages to provide the message receiver more details about the status messages (Armstrong, [0110]).

58.   Claims 41, 44, 48, 51, 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson, in view of Armstrong and Parry.

59.   For claim 41, Simpson discloses an electronic device for a network system having a plurality of terminal devices and an electronic device whose function is shared by said plurality of terminal devices, said plurality of terminal devices and said electronic device being communicatively connected through a network, operational parameters of said electronic device being set by said plurality of terminal devices through the network, said network system comprising:

a modifying system that modifies the operational parameters in accordance with a request for modification of the operational parameters requested by a terminal device ([0076], second user requests to print job with a second settings other than first user's settings);

a message storing system that stores a message with which the operational

parameters are modified in relationship with modified operational parameters (fig. 2A,

storage devices, [0076], [0074], e.g., messages indicating "interrupt request" or "job

deferred" associated with print jobs with different settings); and

a message outputting system that outputs the message stored in relationship

with the modified operational parameters by said message storing system in response

to an output command of a message corresponding to the modified operational

parameters ([0070], output, e.g., "job deferred" message when print job is changed or

modified and second settings are applied).

Simpson does not explicitly disclose that the message is input by a user of the

terminal device.

However, Armstrong discloses using customized messages that can be input by

a user instead of default messages ([0110]).

Simpson does not explicitly disclose operational parameters are requested

independently from issuing a processing request by a user; although Simpson discloses

that printer parameters or settings can be set for a certain user for a certain time period

without mentioning which particular print jobs or processing requests are associated

with the settings ([0068])

However, Parry discloses the same (fig. 3, 4, panels for printer settings separate

from print job processing)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Simpson, Armstrong and Parry to customize

status messages to provide the message receiver more details about the status

messages (Armstrong, [0110]) and to have separate printer settings from printer

processing so that users can provide settings in advance of processing for example.

60.   Claim 44 is rejected for the same rationale as in claim 41.

61.   For claim 48, Simpson-Armstrong further discloses the operational parameters

comprise functional parameters and protection parameters, the protection parameters

being parameters entered by the first user, independent from a processing request, to

control the modification of the functional parameters (Simpson, [0068], protection

parameters are user settings regarding when certain printer parameters or functional

parameters can be set, e.g. all boss's print jobs can be set so that they are

uninterruptable independently of the print job request (by only checking the name of the

boss) and when functional parameters can be set, for example (examiner's

interpretation), from 2 to 4 PM, Andy's jobs with certain settings are uninterruptable);

the message storing system stores a message input by the first user of the

terminal device with which the functional parameters and protection parameters are

modified in relationship with modified functional parameters and protection parameters;

and the message outputting system outputs the message stored in relationship with the

modified functional parameters and protection parameters by said message storing

system in response to an output command of a message corresponding to the modified

functional parameters and protection parameters (Simpson, fig. 2A, storage devices,

[0076], [0074], e.g., messages indicating "interrupt request" or "job deferred" associated

with print jobs with different settings; [0070], output, e.g., "job deferred" message when

print job is changed or modified and second settings are applied, Armstrong, [0110]).

Simpson-Armstrong does not explicitly disclose operational parameters are

requested independently from issuing a processing request by a user; although

Simpson discloses that printer parameters or settings can be set for a certain user for a

certain time period without mentioning which particular print jobs or processing requests

are associated with the settings ([0068])

However, Parry discloses the same (fig. 3, 4, panels for printer settings separate

from print job processing)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Simpson, Armstrong and Parry to customize

status messages to provide the message receiver more details about the status

messages (Armstrong, [0110]) and to have separate printer settings from printer

processing so that users can provide settings in advance of processing for example.

62.   Claims 51 and 54 are rejected for the same rationale as in claim 48.

Conclusion

63.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure is disclosed in form PTO 392.

64.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

65.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hieu T. Hoang whose telephone number is 571-270-

1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m.,

EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HH

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152